

# Exhibit L

GREGORY R. OXFORD (SBN 62333)  
ISAACS CLOUSE CROSE & OXFORD LLP  
21515 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 950  
Torrance, California 90503  
Telephone: (310) 316-1990  
Facsimile: (310) 316-1330  
goxford@icclawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendant  
General Motors LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM D. PILGRIM, WALTER  
GOETZMAN, JEROME E. PEDERSON,  
MICHAEL FERNANDEZ, ROY  
HALEEN, HOWARD KOPEL, ROBERT  
C. MURPHY, MIKE PETERS,  
CHRISTOPHER CONSTANTINE,  
JOHN PARSONS, LYLE DUNAHOO,  
AARON CLARK, EDWIN WILLIAM  
KRAUSE, DAVID SHELDON, JARED  
KILEY, JEFF KOLODZI, MORRIS  
SMITH, ANDRES FREY, individuals, on  
behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GENERAL MOTORS COMPANY LLC  
and DOES 1-50 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-08047-JFW-E

**STIPULATION RE FILING OF  
AMENDED COMPLAINT AND  
TIME TO RESPOND, TIME TO  
FILE CLASS CERTIFICATION  
MOTION, AND VACATION OF  
SCHEDULING CONFERENCE**

Complaint Served: Oct. 23, 2015

Current Response Date: Dec. 14, 2015

Hon. John F. Walter

WHEREAS, plaintiffs' 188-page complaint contains 1,099 numbered  
paragraphs and asserts claims under federal law and the laws of twelve states;

1 WHEREAS, the parties previously have stipulated to extend the date for  
2 defendant's response to the complaint by thirty days, to Monday, December 14,  
3 2015, pursuant to L.R. 8-3;

4 WHEREAS, defendant General Motors LLC ("New GM"), sued erroneously  
5 herein as "General Motors Company LLC," came into existence shortly before  
6 July 10, 2009,<sup>1</sup> the date on which it purchased certain specified business assets of  
7 the former General Motors Corporation ("Old GM") free and clear of all of Old  
8 GM's liabilities (with limited exceptions) in a transaction approved by the United  
9 States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York ("Bankruptcy  
10 Court") pursuant to Section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code ("363 Sale") by Order of  
11 the Bankruptcy Court dated July 5, 2009 ("Sale Order");

12 WHEREAS, all of the model year 2006, 2007, 2008 and some or all of the  
13 model year 2009 Chevrolet Corvettes that are the subject of the eighteen individual  
14 plaintiffs' allegations were manufactured by Old GM;

15 WHEREAS, New GM, the defendant in this case, contends that many, but  
16 not all, of the claims asserted in plaintiffs' complaint are Retained Liabilities of  
17 Old GM for which New GM has no responsibility or liability to plaintiffs and  
18 contends that the Sale Order prohibits and enjoins the assertion of such claims  
19 against New GM;

20 WHEREAS, New GM asserted these positions in a letter to plaintiffs'  
21 counsel dated October 28, 2015;

22 WHEREAS, plaintiffs dispute New GM's positions;

23 WHEREAS, the Sale Order approving the 363 Sale prohibits the assertion of  
24 certain types of claims against New GM based on the conduct of Old GM, as

---

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> As reflected in the accompanying Rule 7.1 disclosure, General Motors LLC is a  
27 Delaware limited liability company and is an indirect wholly-owned subsidiary of  
28 General Motors Company, a Delaware corporation that is publicly traded. General  
Motors LLC operates the GM automotive manufacturing, sales, service and parts  
business in the United States.

1 described in (1) *In re Motors Liquidation Co.*, 529 B.R. 510 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y.  
2 2015) (“Decision”), and (2) the Bankruptcy Court’s judgment entered on June 1,  
3 2015 implementing the rulings contained in the Decision, *In re Motors Liquidation*  
4 *Co.*, No. 09-50026, Dkt 13177 (“Judgment”);

5 WHEREAS, in a further decision issued on November 9, 2015, the  
6 Bankruptcy Court delineated certain types of claims that are – and certain types of  
7 claims that are not – barred by the terms of the Sale Order, Decision and Judgment,  
8 *In re Motors Liquidation Co.*, No. 09-50026, Dkt 13533 (“November 9 Decision”);

9 WHEREAS, the Sale Order (§ 71) retained exclusive jurisdiction in the  
10 Bankruptcy Court to interpret the provisions of its order;

11 WHEREAS, plaintiffs contend that, despite this reservation of jurisdiction,  
12 the Bankruptcy Court has specifically permitted certain types of claims and issues  
13 to be decided by non-bankruptcy courts;

14 WHEREAS, New GM contends that some of plaintiffs’ claims in its current  
15 complaint are not included in the categories of claims and issues that the  
16 Bankruptcy Court has permitted to be decided by non-bankruptcy courts (*see*  
17 Decision, Judgment and November 9 Decision);

18 WHEREAS, following issuance of the November 9 Decision by the  
19 Bankruptcy Court, undersigned counsel for plaintiffs and New GM met and  
20 conferred regarding the most efficient and expeditious means of resolving the  
21 question of whether some of plaintiffs’ claims are barred by the terms of the Sale  
22 Order, Decision, Judgment and November 9 Decision;

23 WHEREAS, without conceding the validity of New GM’s positions,  
24 plaintiffs’ counsel has agreed to file an amended complaint (1) to address at least  
25 some of the claims that, as presently pled, New GM believes to be barred and (2)  
26 to add additional parties plaintiff and claims for relief;

27 WHEREAS, given the size of the current complaint and the likely size of the  
28 amended complaint, plaintiffs and New GM both have asked the other for

1 additional time to complete, respectively, (1) the drafting of the amended  
2 complaint and (2) New GM's review and analysis thereof and its response thereto;

3 WHEREAS, New GM's review of the amended complaint will include its  
4 assessment of whether any of the claims for relief to be asserted therein are barred  
5 by pertinent provisions of bankruptcy law, the Sale Order, the Decision, the  
6 Judgment and the November 9 Decision;

7 WHEREAS, if New GM determines, based on such assessment, that further  
8 action by the Bankruptcy Court is necessary, it would seek an agreed stay of these  
9 proceedings pending the Bankruptcy Court's rulings or, if necessary, seek an order  
10 of the Bankruptcy Court enforcing the injunction contained in the Sale Order;

11 WHEREAS, L.R. 23-3 requires plaintiffs in a putative class action to file a  
12 motion for class certification within ninety days of commencing the action, which  
13 the parties respectfully submit would be premature in light of the foregoing facts;

14 WHEREAS, this Court has scheduled a Scheduling Conference for January  
15 4, 2016 which the parties in light of the foregoing facts respectfully submit would  
16 also be premature;

17 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between plaintiffs and defendant, by  
18 and through their undersigned counsel, that the Court may enter its order as  
19 follows:

20 1. Defendant shall not be required to respond to the current complaint;  
21 instead, plaintiffs shall file an amended complaint no later than December 23,  
22 2015;

23 2. Defendant shall have forty-five (45) days, to and including February  
24 3, 2016 to answer, move or otherwise respond to the amended complaint, subject  
25 to any stay that may be issued pending action by the Bankruptcy Court. For the  
26 avoidance of doubt, New GM shall have the right to seek such orders as may be  
27 appropriate from the Bankruptcy Court enforcing the injunction in the Sale Order;

1           3.     The time for filing a motion for class certification under Local Rule  
2 23-3 is extended, and the requirements of that rule are excused. The deadline for  
3 the filing of a motion for class certification will be set at the Scheduling  
4 Conference or at such other time as this Court may deem appropriate.

5           4.     The Scheduling Conference set for January 4, 2016 is vacated, subject  
6 to being re-set at such time as this Court may deem appropriate.

7  
8 DATED: November 30, 2015   ANDRE E. JARDINI  
9                                   K.L. MYLES  
10                                  KNAPP PETERSEN & CLARKE

11                                  [s] Andre E. Jardini

12                                  Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13 DATED: November 30, 2015   GREGORY R. OXFORD  
14                                  ISAACS CLOUSE CROSE & OXFORD LLP

15                                  [s] Gregory R. Oxford

16                                  Attorneys for Defendant

17                                  **Attestation per L.R. 5-4.3.4(a)(2)(i)**

18           The undersigned hereby attests that that all signatories listed above concur in  
19 this filing's content and have authorized the filing.

20                                  [s] Gregory R. Oxford

21                                  Attorneys for Defendant  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1 GREGORY R. OXFORD (SBN 62333)  
2 ISAACS CLOUSE CROSE & OXFORD LLP  
3 21515 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 950  
4 Torrance, California 90503  
Telephone: (310) 316-1990  
Facsimile: (310) 316-1330  
goxford@icclawfirm.com

5 Attorneys for Defendant  
6 General Motors LLC  
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 WESTERN DIVISION  
11

12 WILLIAM D. PILGRIM, WALTER  
13 GOETZMAN, JEROME E. PEDERSON,  
14 MICHAEL FERNANDEZ, ROY  
15 HALEEN, HOWARD KOPEL, ROBERT  
16 C. MURPHY, MIKE PETERS,  
17 CHRISTOPHER CONSTANTINE,  
18 JOHN PARSONS, LYLE DUNAHOO,  
19 AARON CLARK, EDWIN WILLIAM  
20 KRAUSE, DAVID SHELDON, JARED  
KILEY, JEFF KOLODZI, MORRIS  
SMITH, ANDRES FREY, individuals, on  
behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

21 Plaintiff,

22 vs.

23 GENERAL MOTORS COMPANY LLC  
24 and DOES 1-50 inclusive,

25 Defendants.  
26

Case No. 2:15-cv-08047-JFW-E

**ORDER ON STIPULATION RE  
FILING OF AMENDED  
COMPLAINT AND TIME TO  
RESPOND, TIME TO FILE CLASS  
CERTIFICATION MOTION, AND  
VACATION OF SCHEDULING  
CONFERENCE**

Complaint Served: Oct. 23, 2015

Current Response Date: Dec. 14, 2015

Hon. John F. Walter

27 Based on the stipulation of counsel filed on November 30, 2015, and good  
28 cause appearing therefor, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:




1           1. Defendant shall not be required to respond to the current complaint;  
2 instead, plaintiffs shall file an amended complaint no later than December 23,  
3 2015;

4           2. Defendant shall have forty-five (45) days, to and including February  
5 3, 2016 to answer, move or otherwise respond to the amended complaint, subject  
6 to any stay that may be issued pending action by the Bankruptcy Court. For the  
7 avoidance of doubt, New GM shall have the right to seek such orders as may be  
8 appropriate from the Bankruptcy Court enforcing the injunction in the Sale Order;

9           3. The time for filing a motion for class certification under Local Rule  
10 23-3 is extended, and the requirements of that rule are excused. The deadline for  
11 the filing of a motion for class certification will be set at the Scheduling  
12 Conference or at such other time as this Court may deem appropriate.

13           4. The Scheduling Conference set for January 4, 2016 is vacated, subject  
14 to being re-set at such time as this Court may deem appropriate.

15  
16           Dated: December 1, 2015

17  
18             
19           Hon. John F. Walter  
20           United States District Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28